



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

tains a critical text for twenty-eight stanzas of the poem, which the editor begs "to have considered as a first attempt." In regard to this constructed text, the work is sound, the alexandrine verses are restored, the footnotes contain much confirmatory material and comments on the doubtful passages, and the versions of four printed editions face each page of text. There are, however, several points in which the present reviewer differs from the editor: The *c* before *e* and *i* (*deuocion* 1b, *mancebo* 3a, etc.) should be restored to *ç* in conformity with thirteenth-century usage.—It is doubtful if *gran* (1b, 3c, etc.) is admissible in place of *grand* or *grant*.—The apocopated form *tod* in *tod mandamiento*, 6a, of which the editor expressed doubt, seems impossible, since such a form is regular only before a vowel or a dental consonant.—*Pareze* 109b (= *pareçe se*) is doubtful. While the apocopated *parez* for *pareçe* is correct in itself, if we add or join to it the pronominal *se* the natural law of assimilation would cause the voiced sibilant *z* to become voiceless *ç*. A more natural reading of the verse would be *Ca aparez la vianda por la boca abrir*, thereby retaining the initial word of the extant texts.—In verse 53b, the reading *Com(o) faz el pazerero* would necessitate less change in the extant versions than the adopted reading *Como (haz) el pazerero*.—Finally, there are several cases where the editor has adopted a principle of text construction which is at least open to discussion; e. g. the use of *ñ* for *nn* (*engaña* 53d, *daño* 65b, etc.); the admission of enclisis with *lo* or use of accusative *le* in referring to inanimate objects (*Si ouieres lazerio, lieual con alegria* 10a); *mb, mp* for *nb, np* (*nombre* 2a, *limpieza* 9c, etc.); *como* for *commo* 1c, etc.).

The book concludes with two appendices. The first treats of the terminations of the imperfect indicative of the second and third conjugations, and contains much new and interesting material in support of Hanssen's theory that the terminations in question are *ia, iês, iê, iêmos, iês, iên*. The present reviewer accepts the theory only within a certain limited field, and as he intends to treat this subject in detail in a future number of *Modern Language Notes*, the discussion may be omitted at this time. There are, however, two principles which Pietsch establishes in a satisfactory manner; namely, that the *ia* form of the third person sin-

gular is the proper one in rhyme and at the end of the first hemistich. In the second appendix we have a conclusive study in support of the gerunds formed from strong-perfect stems.

In short, the treatise on the *Disticha Catonis* forms a valuable addition to our knowledge of Old Spanish. The material is well arranged and accompanied by appropriate commentary, especially in regard to bibliography and linguistics. Furthermore, while the author's conclusions in regard to the date of the oldest Spanish version of the *Catón* must be revised in the light of more recent investigations, we have to thank him for bringing to our notice an old Spanish poem which, heretofore, had remained practically unknown.

C. CARROLL MARDEN.

Johns Hopkins University.

## GERMAN LITERATURE.

GOETHE: *Hermann und Dorothea*. Edited, with Notes, by C. A. BUCHHEIM, Ph. D., M. A., late Professor of the German Language and Literature in King's College, London, and Emma S. Buchheim. With an Introduction by Edward Dowden, LL. D., D. C. L., Professor of Oratory and English Literature in the University of Dublin, President of the English Goethe Society. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1901. xxxvii + 152 pp.

The *Hermann und Dorothea* of Goethe has been for many years a favorite text with the editors of German classics. All who love the poem will welcome the edition by Dr. Buchheim. Many a teacher of German will be strangely moved as Dr. Buchheim's edition comes to his desk, realizing as he must that it is the last of a long series of texts so well edited by this pioneer editor.

To those who know but little of Dr. Buchheim's active and fruitful life the Biographical Sketch by his daughter Emma S. Buchheim, with which the book begins, is all too brief. One can easily believe that the privations and vicissitudes of his early life, his love of all literary work for its own sake, his investigations into the realm of German Literature must have developed the

eminent scholar and noble man that Dr. Buchheim proved to be.

Carl Adolf Buchheim was born January 22, 1828. He was a student at the University of Vienna in 1848 when his too active participation in the movement for political reform necessitated his flight from Austria. Travelling through Germany, Switzerland, Belgium, and France, he finally went to England, in which country alone in Europe he was not subject to extradition. It was not long before he established himself as a teacher, and in 1863 he was appointed Professor of the German Language and Literature at King's College, London, which position he held till his death in 1900. Such a life of service and meritorious record is certainly worthy of imitation and emulation. The thought which stimulated Dr. Buchheim to persistent endeavor is contained in the well-known line from Goethe's *Iphigenie*, with which quotation the Sketch closes:

"Ein unnütz Leben ist ein früher Tod."

In a new edition of a poem which has been so frequently edited and on the whole so well edited, we have a right to expect improvement along old lines or development in new lines. It is a question if our expectations are fulfilled in either respect in the present edition. Throughout the entire series of German texts so ably edited by Dr. Buchheim there has been an individuality not common to the editions of American scholars; but it seems as if Dr. Buchheim has hardly kept pace with the improvements made in some of our American editions. At any rate he has not recognized in this last work features which the reviewer has been pleased to see in many of our recent American editions of German texts.

The Introduction by Professor Dowden treats in an interesting manner, The Salzburg Exiles, The Process of Composition, Goethe and the French Revolution, Goethe's Hellenism, The Louise of Voss, and The Place and the Persons. The portion on Goethe's Hellenism is treated in an unusual manner. Instead of presenting to us in more or less detail the classical influences in Goethe's life conducive to the production of a poem of this kind, Professor Dowden uses most of the space under this caption in a reply to Edmond Scherer's sarcastic criticism of Goethe's

poem. I believe Professor Dowden has the better of the argument. It would have been appropriate if, at the close of this portion of his Introduction, Professor Dowden had chosen to cite examples from the poem showing in a marked degree the Homeric influence on Goethe. It is a matter of regret that Professor Dowden did not extend the limits of his Introduction so as to include the discussion of such questions as the Style, Text, Metre and Classification of the Poem, all of which subjects are thoroughly pertinent to an Introduction and would have been of interest and value to the student.

Of the text there is little to be said in the way of criticism or correction. The printed page certainly presents a crowded, even indistinct, impression. This is perhaps inevitable with the long hexameter verses and no breaks in the pages showing a change of thought or change of speaker. In a number of instances the lines are too long to be numbered with the multiple of five and the next lower or next higher number is used according as the preceding or following line offers room for the number. This irregularity might have been avoided had the lines been numbered on the left side of the page. A somewhat larger page would have produced a much better effect, or if the size of the page must be maintained to keep the book uniform with the rest of the series, then larger type, more liberal spacing and a larger number of pages should have been used. This is, to be sure, a small matter but at the present standard of book making even such small details should not be overlooked.

The text is collated with that of the Weimar edition, but offers numerous variations in the pointing. I believe the punctuation of the Weimar edition is preferable in the following instances. In Canto I, l. 130 a comma after *fort*; l. 167 a comma after *Runde*; in II, l. 34 Dr. Buchheim has changed *Schwangre* to *Kranke*; l. 124 there should be a comma after *Schlaf*; l. 147 a comma after *bauen*; in III, l. 17 omit the comma after *verfault*; l. 29 an interrogation point after *Pflaster*; l. 80 an interrogation point after *haben*; l. 93 a semicolon after *Muscheln*; in IV, l. 87 an interrogation point after *bleiben*; l. 88 an interrogation point after *Unfall*; l. 236 an exclamation point after *Vater*; lines 199 and 200 of the Weimar edition

have been omitted entirely; in V, l. 146 a comma after *dahin*; a comma after *zu*; l. 147 a comma after *Rasch*; in VI, l. 93 a semicolon after *köstlich*; l. 99 a semicolon after *wagen*; l. 100 the Weimar edition has a colon after *ward*; to me a semicolon seems preferable; l. 312 a semicolon after *bereitet*; in VII, l. 39 a semicolon after *schöpfen*; l. 162 a semi-colon after *gern*; in VIII, l. 19 the Weimar edition reads *kluges* instead of *gutes*; l. 85 a semicolon after *Hände*; in IX, l. 37 a semicolon after *vollenden*; l. 147 a colon after *getroffen*; l. 284 a period after *bereitet*; l. 285 a period after *dankbar*; l. 286 a semicolon after *auf*.

I have noticed but two slight errors in the press-work: xxxv, l. 10 and p. 51, l. 261.

I find more to criticise in the nature of Dr. Buchheim's notes than in the interpretation. The notes seem to me to be too much of a grammatical, too little of a literary nature; in this respect his edition suffers in comparison with our most recent American editions. If the *Hermann und Dorothea* is to be read by pupils of high-school age, the notes may be as numerous as Dr. Buchheim offers, though in many cases the free translation or paraphrase should be accompanied by a more literal translation or an explanation of the grammatical point in question. I believe great care should be exercised—greater than has oftentimes been the case heretofore—not to supply too many notes. If the pupil, turning to his notes, finds help of which he is in no need, he begins to lose confidence in their value and finally fails to consult them altogether. If the text is to be read by college students they may be appealed to more readily by a few suggestive literary notes than by a multiplicity of notes which are mainly grammatical or lexicographical. Such literary notes need in no way infringe on the province of the teacher, but may rather, by stimulating the pupil's thought in the preparation of his lesson, add much to the interest of the recitation hour.

With the interpretation in Dr. Buchheim's notes, I agree except in a few instances. In Canto I, l. 4 with the statement, "The verbs *rennen* and *laufen* are synonymous," it would have been advisable to have given examples showing the limitations of each, since they are not always interchangeable. L. 114 the force of *nur* is misinterpreted in the translation, "which are only

stowed away;" *nur* adds an indefinite force in a subordinate clause, equal to the English "ever" in "whoever," "whatever," etc.; the sense is rather, "The manifold goods what(so)ever a well appointed house contains;" cf. VI, 238; VII, 4. L. 181 the force of *erst recht* is not sufficiently brought out by, "it is just in time of danger," but rather, "it is above all in time of danger." In II, l. 175 I prefer the interpretation "fine and strong" for *feinem und starkem* rather than "fine and coarse." L. 212 is translated by Dr. Buchheim, "and round whom the half-silken shreds are hanging in summer," and he then adds, "Most commentators refer the word *Läppchen* to the light, short summer-coat worn in those days." If Dr. Buchheim accepts the latter interpretation his note could have been made more intelligible by implying it in his translation and following the translation with an explanation of the literal meaning of *Läppchen*. If he prefers "shreds" as the interpretation in this particular line, I can not agree with him, believing, as I do, that the word refers to the coats made of cheap, flimsy, half-silken material. In IV, l. 8 *doppelten Höfe* is translated, "the two courtyards containing respectively the stables and the well-built barns;" I prefer to refer this line to II, l. 138, to the two courtyards which, formerly separated by a partition, have since the conflagration and the marriage of the two children been joined together. L. 28 *unbehauenen* is "roughly-hewn," rather than "unpolished." In VI, l. 238 the same suggestions may be made as in the case of I, 114; *nur* should have a more indefinite force than is implied in, "that can afflict a loving heart;" it is rather "what(so)ever can afflict a loving heart." L. 247 I question if "tamely" best translates *sachte*; the word is in contrast with *eilendem* in l. 235 and has the meaning of "slowly," "noiselessly," "quietly," (i. e., so as to avoid attracting attention), to which *Beschämung* (l. 246) adds the element of embarrassment.

Apart from the above suggestions the edition is acceptably accurate. It is my belief that, while it will be a welcome addition to our list of annotated Goethe texts, it cannot fill the larger place occupied by two of our American editions, one of which equals it from the grammatical standpoint, while the other surpasses it from the literary standpoint.

An index and a brief bibliography would have been valuable additions to the edition.

ARTHUR N. LEONARD.

Bates College.

While I have read Mr. von Noé's paper with pleasure, I must confess that it leaves me in the state of mind of the old fellow in Plautus, after his friend has labored to clear away his doubts—

'nunc sum multo incertior quam dudum.'

WM. HAND BROWNE.

Johns Hopkins University.

---



---

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### 'FEWTER' AGAIN.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes* :

SIRS:—I am glad that my request for information (*v. M. L. N.* xvi, 8) has induced Mr. A. C. von Noé to investigate a matter which apparently nobody clearly understands, and to embody the results of his researches in an interesting paper in *Modern Philology* (I, 2).

Mr. von Noé's conclusion is that the fewter was merely the felt covering of the saddle; that the knight, when about to charge, took his lance from his squire, fewtered it—that is, held it for awhile upright on the saddle—and then lowered it to a horizontal position for the charge.

To me this explanation presents these difficulties:—(1) Why should the knight, upon receiving his lance, stand it upright on the saddle before gripping it for the charge? (2) Why should this superfluous and rather irrational intermediate manœuvre be constantly mentioned in the descriptions of combats, as if it, and not the levelling the lance, was the important thing? (3) Where a knight is riding unattended (and therefore carrying his lance) (*e. g. Rauf Coilyear*, 809) as soon as he sees his enemy, or comes within charging distance, he fewters his lance and charges him. (4) Such phrases as: 'to him he priked, With spere festened in fewter him for to spille' (*W. of Pal.* 3436) seem to me quite incompatible with this explanation.

I have somewhere seen the suggestion that the fewter was a socket hung by a chain from the saddle. The knight might then use it as a support for the lance when carried vertically, and as a *point d'appui* for the charge; but nothing of the kind appears (so far as I have seen) in the old illustrations.

---

### POETA, POEMA, POESIS.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes* :

SIRS:—Professor Saintsbury in his *History of Criticism*, II, 204, speaking of Ben Jonson's famous passage in the *Discoveries*, and the differentiation of *poeta*, *poema*, *poesis*, remarks that Dr. Spingarn "goes too far" in tracing this to Scaliger or Maggi. It is a "common form," says Professor Saintsbury, nearly as old as Rhetoric. I may point out that in the treatise *De Differentiis*, attributed to Cornelius Fronto (Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, VII, 525), the author distinguishes "*Poetice* et *poesin* et *poema* et *poeticum*. *poetice* est rei, ut *historice*, *poesis* operum contextus, *poema* certis pedibus et legitimis inclusa materia, *poeticum* in *poeta* utile est." Everybody came to discuss the matter. See Trapp, *Praelectiones*, I, 41: "per *Poema* . . . intelligendum est *Opus Poetae*; per *Poesin*, *Actionem*; per *Poeticam*, *Artem sive Habitus*." Trapp speaks of the constant confusion in the use of *Poesis* and *Poetica*. Scaliger, of course, had given the distinction in his *Poetics* (ed. 1561, p. 5); and Vossius, Cap. IV, § 1, defines *poema* as "*materia, opus*," *poesis* as "*operatio seu actio quā poema contextitur*," and *poetice* as "*habitus ipse praecepta ad poesin disponens*." But Ben, as Professor Saintsbury hints, had before him in all probability the commonplaces which Scaliger and Vossius knew. Fronto's little treatise was accessible for Jonson in the Paris folio of 1516 (*Grammatici Illustres XII*) and in subsequent editions.

FRANCIS B. GUMMERE.

Haverford College.